



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/761,874

01/21/2004

Terrance L. Bescup

59486US002

3143

32692

7590

09/10/2007

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY

PO BOX 33427

ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

BASHORE, ALAIN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/10/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com

LegalDocketing@mmm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/761,874	Applicant(s) BESCU ET AL.	
	Examiner Alain L. Bashore	Art Unit 1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-24, 26-30 in the reply filed on 6-27-07 is acknowledged.

Claim 25 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6-27-07.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. It is noted that some references have been listed on IDS forms, but other references described in the specification have not been listed on any IDS. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892 or by applicant on an IDS, they have not been considered.

Any citation of prior art by applicant under "other" in an IDS that is listed without a date will be assumed to be prior art with a date of at least one year prior to any priority date afforded applicant.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: a patent application is referred to on page 11, but is incomplete without U.S. serial number and current status.

The disclosure is also objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, "the unembedded optical elements" lack antecedent basis.

In claim 8, "the mechanical mixing" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-9, 13-14, 21-24, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmquist et al ('196) in view of Song et al.

Palmquist et al discloses a method of making retroreflective elements. A plurality of core particles is provided, and coating of the particles with an unsolidified polymeric composition forming coated particles this then performed. The coated particles with optical elements is combined (by mechanical mixing) such that optical elements are embedded in the unsolidified polymeric composition and solidifying the polymeric composition forming retroreflective element. There is separating of the retroreflector elements from the unembedded optical elements (col 3, lines 1-73; col 4, lines 27-36).

Regarding specific core particle type and size ranges, the reference to Palmquist discloses variable particles, such that one with ordinary skill in the art would utilize any specific type and size for specific application in absence of unexpected or unobvious results.

Art Unit: 1762

Palmquist et al does not explicitly disclose a continuous process or where the combining further includes at least one rotating mixing member further being a disc.

Song et al discloses a continuous process for coating particles including use of a rotating member further being a disc (see fig 2; col 5, lines 25-42).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a continuous process for coating particles including the use of a rotating member further being a disc because Palmquist et al discloses coating particles, and that a continuous process is more efficient than a batch process per se in engineering generally.

8. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmquist et al ('196) in view of Song et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Ajax LynFlow Continuous Mixer Reference (LynFlow reference).

Palmquist et al ('196) and Song et al do not disclose the mixing member being an extruder screw or at least two co-rotating or counter-rotating mixing members.

The LynFlow reference discloses a mixing member being an extruder screw or at least two co-rotating or counter-rotating mixing members (see page 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a mixing member being an extruder screw or at least two co-rotating or counter-rotating mixing members because the LynFlow reference teaches advantageous per se "(see paragraphs under "the principle" section).

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmquist et al ('196) in view of Song et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Eirich et al.

Palmquist et al ('196) and Song et al do not disclose the mixing member comprising a grinding plate.

Eirich et al discloses a mixing member comprising a grinding plate (see fig 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a mixing member comprising a grinding plate because Eirich et al teaches advantages of a grinding plate (col 1, lines 30-31).

Art Unit: 1762

10. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmquist et al ('196) in view of Song et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Lange ('469).

Palmquist et al ('196) and Song et al do not disclose optical elements as microcrystalline beads as glass-ceramic beads or non-viterous beads.

Lange discloses optical elements as microcrystalline beads as glass-ceramic beads or non-viterous beads (col 1, lines 28-68; col 2, lines 1-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include optical elements as microcrystalline beads as glass-ceramic beads or non-viterous beads because Lange teaches durability.

11. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmquist et al ('196) in view of Song et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Schleifstein.

Palmquist et al ('196) and Song et al do not disclose an adhesion promoting agent, or a floatation agent that further is a flurochemical.

Art Unit: 1762

Schleifstein discloses an adhesion promoting agent, and a floatation agent that further is a fluorochemical (col 3, lines 65-67; col 4, lines 1-54).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include an adhesion promoting agent, and a floatation agent that further is a fluorochemical because Schlesifstein teaches advantages for promoting characteristics of floatation and adhesion.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alain L. Bashore/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762